

Response  
Application No. 10/657,194  
Attorney Docket No. 021669

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. It is believed that this Response is fully responsive to the Office Action dated April 2, 2007.

#### **As to the Merits:**

As to the merits of this case, the Examiner now relies on the newly cited references of Sekiguchi and Janik in setting forth the following rejections:

claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Janik; and  
claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Sekiguchi.

Each of these rejections is respectfully traversed.

#### **The Janik Reference:**

With regard to claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Janik discloses a gateway card 38 connected to an information processor 34 with the operation of the information processor 34 being maintained in a power saving mode, and specifically relies on the disclosure in paragraphs [0173], [0181], [0184] and [0191] of the Janik reference.

However, it is respectfully submitted that Janik fails to disclose that the information processor 34 is maintained in a power saving operation mode in these specific paragraphs, as asserted by the Examiner.

Response  
Application No. 10/657,194  
Attorney Docket No. 021669

Further, according to paragraph [0234] of Janik:

Another function that is performed by the BIOS modification software is to modify the internal settings of PC 34 that control the power saving modes and control parameters which include parameters such as when the PC display is turned off, and when drives are spun down while PC 34 is operating. The BIOS modification software allows for the “always-on” operation of PC 34. In this case, the PC can be put into the low-power mode with monitor off and with the drive of spinning. Control of various power saving modes is also provided for users at the operating system level. The Advanced Configuration and Power Interface is a set of functions that provide control of PC 34 power usage, allowing the computer to be put into various suspend states, as well as spinning down drives and other functions. Power control functions in core module 42 modify ACPI settings, providing for quiet, low power operation of PC 34.

However, Janik clearly discloses in paragraph [0236] that any access to the Internet 8 is made through the PC 34 which is done in the power-up state, and not in the power saving mode.

As such, it is respectfully submitted that Janik fails to disclose or fairly suggest the features of claim 1 concerning *an access control unit that leads the apparatus to make access to an external apparatus in a state that the operation of the information processor is maintained in a power-saving operation mode, when the access request is accepted in a state that the operation of the information processor is in a power-saving operation mode and also when the access request corresponds to the access to the external apparatus.*

**Independent Claim 3:**

In Item 6 of the Action, the Examiner asserts that Sekiguchi discloses a gateway card 102 that is connected to an information processor 208 in Fig. 2.

However, it is submitted that the Examiner has failed to appreciate that the gateway apparatus 102 in Fig. 2 of Sekiguchi actually includes the operation control processor 208. As such, it is submitted that Sekiguchi fails to disclose the features of the preamble of claim 3 regarding a *gateway card connected to an information processor and that receives and transmits data between different networks*.

The Examiner also asserts that Sekiguchi discloses “an access accepting unit [213 fig. 2] that accepts an access request from an apparatus connected to the networks.” However, reference numeral 213 in Sekiguchi merely depicts a display. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the display 213 by itself fails to constitute *an access accepting unit that accepts an access request from an apparatus connected to the networks*, as called for in claim 3.

In addition, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner’s position set forth in footnote 1 on page 3 of the Action regarding that, “the second system [describe in paragraph 0035] is turned on only when it received access request from an external device

such as 116 and 15 of fig. 1,” is a mis-characterization of the Sekiguchi reference. That is, the second system can not be powered on (or off) by the first system. Instead, the second system is powered on (or off) when accessed via interface 212 by the peripherals 218, 105 or the camera 110, as shown in step S20 (and step S28) in the flow chart of Fig. 4.

As such, it is submitted that the Examiner’s reliance on the Ethernet Connection Controller 225 in the first system of the Home Gateway Apparatus 102, in line 21 of page 2 of the Action, for disclosing the features of claim 3 concerning *an access control unit that leads the apparatus to make access to the information processor in a state that the operation mode is returned from the power-saving operation mode to the normal operation mode, when the access request corresponds to the access to the information processor, and shifts the operation mode from the normal operation mode to the power-saving operation mode after the access ends* lacks merit, since as discussed above the second system can not be powered on or off by the first system.

Moreover, it is submitted that the arguments set forth above with respect to independent claim 3 are also applicable to independent claims 6, 9, 12, 15 and 18 as well.

Response  
Application No. 10/657,194  
Attorney Docket No. 021669

**Independent Claim 1:**

As noted above with regard to claim 3, Sekiguchi fails to disclose the features of the preamble of claim 1 regarding a *gateway card connected to an information processor and that receives and transmits data between different networks.*

In addition, independent claim 1 also calls for *an access control unit that leads the apparatus to make access to an external apparatus in a state that the operation of the information processor is maintained in a power-saving operation mode, when the access request is accepted in a state that the operation of the information processor is in a power-saving operation mode and also when the access request corresponds to the access to the external apparatus.*

With regard to these features of claim 1, the Examiner specifically relies on the disclosure in paragraphs [0043] and [0045] of Sekiguchi in item 8, via claim 4 in item 7 of the Action. However, while paragraph [0043] may disclose that the server controller 224 in the first system periodically receives e-mail data from the Internet service provider (mail server) via the connection line (ISDN), the Examiner has failed to appreciate that such disclosure fails to teach these features of claim 1.

Response  
Application No. 10/657,194  
Attorney Docket No. 021669

More specifically, claim 1 requires that *an access control unit that leads the apparatus to make access to an external apparatus*. In contrast, when the server controller 224 in the first system periodically receives e-mail data from the Internet service provider (mail server), the server controller 224 fails to make an access to an external apparatus.

As such, it is submitted that Sekiguchi fails to disclose or fairly suggest the features of claim 1 concerning *an access control unit that leads the apparatus to make access to an external apparatus in a state that the operation of the information processor is maintained in a power-saving operation mode, when the access request is accepted in a state that the operation of the information processor is in a power-saving operation mode and also when the access request corresponds to the access to the external apparatus*.

Moreover, it is submitted that the arguments set forth above with respect to independent claim 1 are also applicable to independent claims 4, 7, 10, 13 and 16 as well.

**Independent Claims 19 and 20:**

Independent claim 19 calls for *A gateway card that interconnects an information processor, at least one server via a first network, and at least one client via a second network, the first network and the second network having different communication protocols, the information processor having a normal power mode and a power save mode.* Independent claim 20 includes similar features.

With regard to claim 19, the Examiner asserts in item 21 that Sekiguchi discloses:

a gateway card [102 fig. 2] that interconnects an information processor [208 fig. 2], and at least one server via a first network [118, 114 fig. 1], and at least one client via a second network [116, 115 fig. 1], the first network and the second network having different communication protocols [PIAFS, PHS, Ethernet fig. 2], the information processor having a normal power mode and a power save mode [paragraph 0009-0010].

However, according to paragraph [0024] Sekiguchi discloses:

A personal computer 115 outside of home, by equipping a PHS card, is connected to an ISDN 117 that supports PIAFS, and is capable of PHS communication with the home gateway apparatus 102 via the Internet. A gateway 118 located on the ISDN 117 provides services such as image and protocol conversion to display PHS data from the home gateway apparatus 102 on a mobile phone. A mobile phone 116 is a portable phone with a display to view images of a home monitor 105.

As such, it is submitted that the mobile phone 116 and the personal computer 115 are on the same network as the gateway 118 and the internet 114. Accordingly, it is submitted that Sekiguchi fails to disclose the features of claim 19 concerning *A gateway card that interconnects an information processor, at least one server via a first network,*

Response  
Application No. 10/657,194  
Attorney Docket No. 021669

*and at least one client via a second network, the first network and the second network having different communication protocols, the information processor having a normal power mode and a power save mode.*

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants submit that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

**WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP**



Thomas E. Brown  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 44,450  
Telephone: (202) 822-1100  
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

TEB/nrp